

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
6 EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
7

8 ROYAL MINT COMPANY, INC., a  
9 Washington corporation,  
10 Plaintiff,  
11 v.

12 DOW AGROSCIENCES, LLC, a  
13 Delaware limited liability company,  
14 Defendant.  
15

NO. 2:14-CV-00233-SAB

**ORDER DENYING  
STIPULATED MOTION FOR  
PROTECTIVE ORDER**

16 Before the Court is parties' Stipulated Motion for Entry of Stipulated  
17 Protective Order Regarding Confidential Information. ECF No. 26. The parties  
18 seek a protective order "to ensure the confidentiality of proprietary business  
19 information, personal information and other information of a sensitive and/or  
20 private nature that has been or may be requested in discovery." This motion was  
21 heard without oral argument.

22 The product of pretrial discovery is presumptively public, although Federal  
23 Rule of Civil Procedure Rule 26(c) permits a district court to override this  
24 presumption upon a showing of "good cause." *San Jose Mercury News, Inc. v.*  
25 *U.S. District Court—Northern Dist. (San Jose)*, 187 F.3d 1096, 1103 (9th Cir.  
26 1999). Rule 26(c) provides that a "court may, for good cause, issue an order to  
27 protect a party or person from annoyance, embarrassment, oppression, or undue  
28 burden or expense." Prior to the grant of a protective order, the moving party must

**ORDER DENYING STIPULATED MOTION  
FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER ~ 1**

1 certify it has “conferred or attempted to confer with other affected parties in an  
2 effort to resolve the dispute *without court action*.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c) (emphasis  
3 added).

4 Where the parties agree, as here, that certain information should remain  
5 confidential, it may be prudent to enter into an agreement setting forth in writing  
6 what information shall remain private. It is unnecessary, however, for such an  
7 agreement to have this Court’s imprimatur. A Court issued protective order is less  
8 necessary since Rule 5(d) was amended to only require filing discovery material  
9 actually used in support of an action. Because not all discovery material need be  
10 filed, most discovery material is not readily accessible to the public. Therefore, the  
11 primary concern regarding confidential materials is how the parties themselves  
12 handle such material. This Court will not hesitate to issue a protective order when  
13 it is necessary, however, the moving party or parties must demonstrate good cause  
14 exists and bears the “burden of showing specific prejudice or harm” that will result  
15 if no protective order is granted. *Phillips v. G.M. Corp.*, 307 F.3d 1206, 1210-11  
16 (9th Cir. 2002). In other words, the moving party must demonstrate why the  
17 parties cannot resolve the issue without court action—a standard that will  
18 generally not be met when the parties agree to the terms of a proposed protective  
19 order.

20 The motion at hand fails to demonstrate specific harm or prejudice that will  
21 result if no protective order is granted. Additionally, the parties appear to be in  
22 agreement on what material is appropriate for discovery and how it should be  
23 handled. Accordingly, the Court denies the stipulated motion for protective order.

24 The proposed protective order also contained instructions for filing certain  
25 materials under seal. A higher standard applies to sealing orders as they relate to  
26 discovery materials in support of dispositive motions. In order for a court to seal  
27 records associated with a dispositive motion, it must base its decision on a  
28 compelling reason tied to an articulated factual basis without relying on

**ORDER DENYING STIPULATED MOTION  
FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER ~ 2**

1 conjecture. *Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 331 F.3d 1122, 1135 (9th Cir.  
2 2003). The compelling basis standard is more stringent than the Rule 26(c) good  
3 cause standard. *See Pintos v. Pacific Creditors Ass'n*, 605 F.3d 665, 679 (9th Cir.  
4 2009). Because the parties have failed to demonstrate that even good cause exists  
5 to support this motion, they have also failed to provide a compelling basis for  
6 sealing any records that may be filed in support of any dispositive motions.

7 The Court encourages the parties to continue cooperating with respect to the  
8 handling of potentially sensitive discovery material. The parties may, upon proper  
9 showing tied to specific discovery material, move the Court to seal certain  
10 discovery filings.

11 Accordingly, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:**

12 Stipulated Motion for Entry of Stipulated Protective Order Regarding  
13 Confidential Information, ECF No. 26, is **DENIED**.

14 **IT IS SO ORDERED.** The District Court Executive is hereby directed to  
15 file this Order and provide copies to counsel.

16 **DATED** this 28th day of January 2015.



21  
22

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Stanley A. Bastian". The signature is written in a cursive style and is positioned above a horizontal line.

23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Stanley A. Bastian  
United States District Judge